



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,387	03/23/2004	Takashi Yamamoto	2635-207	1834

23117 7590 10/29/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

OLSEN, KAJ K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1795

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/806,387	Applicant(s) YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Kaj K. Olsen	Art Unit 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-23-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakae et al (USP 6,340,419) in view of Garvie et al (USP 4,067,745) or Scott Jr. et al (USP 3,935,495).
3. Nakae discloses a gas sensor element comprising a sensor portion having a solid electrolyte member 100 with first and second surfaces having electrodes (11, 12) mounted thereto. Nakae also discloses a heater member having a heating element 160 and one and other surfaces where said sensor portion is integrally laminated on one surface of the heater member and where the other surface of the heater member is contactable to the target gas. See fig. 1 and 2; col. 4, ll. 25-35; and col. 5, ll. 33-50. Nakae does not explicitly disclose that the other surface of the heater member, which is constructed out of alumina, has the specified average roughness. Both Garvie and Scott teach that polished alumina surfaces have greater mechanical strength than unpolished alumina. See Garvie, fig. 7 and col. 6, ll. 27-40 and Scott, col. 1. ll. 59-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of either Garvie or Scott and polish the exposed alumina surface (i.e. the other surface) of Nakae so as to improve the mechanical strength of the underlying alumina surface. With respect to the average roughness being no more than 1.71 microns, finding the

Art Unit: 1795

appropriate level of polishing to arrive at the desired level of strengthening requires only routine skill in the art. It is noted that Garvie indicates that the strengthening continually improves the as a function of the smoothness of the alumina (see fig. 7) thereby motivating one to utilize an extremely fine polishing (i.e. polishing until the surface roughness is less than 1.71 microns).

4. With respect to the at least part having the specified surface roughness being no less than 90 percent of all of the area of the other surface, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to polish all of the bottom surface of Nakae so as to garner the complete strengthening effect that polishing has. Furthermore, because the other surface of Nakae is planar (see fig. 1), polishing the entire bottom surface would be as easy as polishing only a portion of the surface.

5. With respect to the other external surfaces of the heater member, polishing the other lateral surfaces of elements 15 and 16 of Nakae would allow the side surfaces to be strengthened as well.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakae in view of Hata et al (USP 7,108,827).

7. Addressing claim 7 first, Nakae discloses preparing a sensor portion having a solid electrolyte member 100 with first and second surfaces having electrodes (11, 12) mounted thereto. Nakae also discloses preparing a heater member having a heating element 160 and one and other surfaces, laminating the sensor portion to the heater portion and firing the integrally laminated sensor portion and heater member. See fig. 1 and 2; col. 4, ll. 25-35; col. 5, ll. 33-50; and col. 6, ll. 32-37. Nakae does not explicitly recite anything about the base member utilized for the firing step and hence doesn't disclose the use of a base member having a surface

Art Unit: 1795

roughness of no more than 8.55 microns. Hata teaches in an alternate firing process for zirconia structures that the base members 3 that the green elements are placed upon for firing should be polished fine down to a surface roughness of less than 5 or 2 microns so that the green sheets being fired slide readily on the them while they shrink during the firing. See fig. 1 and col. 9, ll. 8-20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize a base member for Nakae that is polished down to at least 8.55 microns surface roughness as taught by Hata so that the green layers of Nakae do not stick during the firing process. Although Hata only explicitly recites that the spacers 3 should be polished, because layer 3a also has green sheets placed on it like spacers 3 (see fig. 1), one possessing ordinary skill in the art would also have been motivated to polish all base member surfaces in contact with the green sheets, including members 3a and 3b of Hata, so that all surfaces of the greens sheet are permitted to freely slide.

8. With respect to claims 1 and 2, Nakae already set forth all the limitations of the claim, but did not explicitly disclose the specified surface roughness. However, as the instant invention evidences, the use of a base member having a surface roughness of less than 8.55 microns would inherently have produced an other surface for the heater member having an average surface roughness of less than 1.71 microns. See “(Second Example)” on pp. 18-20. Because Hata already rendered obvious the use of a base member with a surface roughness of less than 8.55 microns (see above), then Nakae prepared with such a base member would have inherently resulted in an average surface roughness of less than 1.71 microns.

9. With respect to claim 4, the use of polishing to arrive at the less than 1.71 microns constitutes the process of making the device. The determination of patentability for the claim is

Art Unit: 1795

based on the product itself. Because the product of the claim is identical to the invention of Nakae and Hata, the process from which it was made is the same as or obvious over the process utilized by Nakae and Hata (see *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698).

10. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakae in view of Kato et al (USP 6,156,175) and either Garvie or Scott.

11. Nakae discloses preparing a sensor portion having a solid electrolyte member 100 with first and second surfaces having electrodes (11, 12) mounted thereto. Nakae also discloses preparing a heater member having a heating element 160 and one and other surfaces, laminating the sensor portion to the heater portion and firing the integrally laminated sensor portion and heater member. See fig. 1 and 2; col. 4, ll. 25-35; col. 5, ll. 33-50; and col. 6, ll. 32-37. Nakae does not explicitly disclose the step of cooling the fired sensor portion. Kato discloses that a cooling step immediately follows the firing (i.e. sintering) step. See col. 12, ll. 11-36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to cool the sensor as taught by Kato so that the sensor can then be further processed before sensor installation. With respect to the step of treating the other surface of the heater member, both Garvie and Scott teach that polished alumina surfaces have greater mechanical strength than unpolished alumina. See Garvie, fig. 7 and col. 6, ll. 27-40 and Scott, col. 1, ll. 59-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of either Garvie or Scott and polish the exposed alumina surface (i.e. the other surface) of Nakae and Kato so as to improve the mechanical strength of the underlying alumina surface. With respect to the average roughness being no more than 1.71 microns, finding the appropriate level of polishing to arrive at the desired level of strengthening requires

Art Unit: 1795

only routine skill in the art. It is noted that Garvie indicates that the strengthening continually improves the as a function of the smoothness of the alumina (see fig. 7) thereby motivating one to utilize an extremely fine polishing (i.e. polishing until the surface roughness is less than 1.71 microns).

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakae in view of Kato, Garvie or Scott, and Hata.

13. Claim 8 appears to comprise the combined process limitations of claims 5 and 7 (i.e. it combines the cooling and treating of claim 5 with the base member having a surface roughness of less than 8.55 microns of claim 7). However, Nakae and Kato already set forth the process of preparing the sensor portion and heater member, firing the sensor portion and heater member, and cooling. See the rejection of claim 5 above. Hata already set forth the obviousness of utilizing a base member for firing that has been polished down to less than 5 or 2 microns surface roughness for the purpose of allowing the ceramic green sheets to freely slide on the base member during firing. See the rejection of claim 7 above. Finally, Garvie and Scott render obvious the use of treating (i.e. polishing) alumina surfaces so as to improve their strength. See the rejections of claims 1 and 5 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the combined processes of both Hata and Garvie or Scott to provide a base member that permits the fired green sheets to freely slide during firing and to provide sensor having a strengthened alumina base member.

Art Unit: 1795


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaj Olsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1344. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen, can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AU 1795
October 26, 2007


KAJ K. OLSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER